UNDERSTANDING THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF RACIST HATE SPEECH ON AMERICAN UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

By

Jonathan Andre Matusitz

RECOMMENDED:

Pamela M. Wheeler
Laura Umphrey
Jim Brown
Advisory Committee Chair

Jim Brown
Department Head

APPROVED:

Joel Kupsia
Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Dean of the Graduate School

12-7-01
Date

UNDERSTANDING THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF RACIST HATE SPEECH ON AMERICAN UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

A

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty

of the University of Alaska Fairbanks

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Jonathan Andre Matusitz, B.A.

Fairbanks, Alaska

December 2001

ABSTRACT

This research employs narrative methodology in order to understand the lived experience of students who have experienced racist hate speech on American university campuses. Thematic analysis of in-depth, conversational interview capta (Kvale, 1996) was used to find commonalties in co-researchers' experiences. The literature review includes a contextual and historical section on racism, and a detailed, standard definition of racist hate speech. Emergent themes from these narrative interviews were found in regard to victims' experiences of racist hate speech on American university campuses. Those themes are discussed in the order of the co-researchers' experience: (1) indignation and anger, (2) stereotyping, (3) ethnic resentment, and (4) ethnic superiority. The co-researchers' experiences illustrate that racist hate speech is not only talk, but can be experienced through other communicative actions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I, Jonathan Andre Matusitz, sincerely thank all the people who helped me on this project. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Jin Brown, Associate Professor of Communication, for his valuable pieces of advice, support, encouragement, craftsmanship, and expertise on the subject of racist hate speech from a Communication perspective. I am also tremendously thankful to Dr. Brown for accepting me as a graduate student in Professional Communication and for awarding me a Teaching Assistantship in Group Communication. I would like to give my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Pamela McWherter, Associate Professor of Communication, whose humor and kindness have always enhanced my learning and working productivity. Another sincere thanks goes to Dr. Robert Arundale, Professor of Communication, who gave me the idea to write a paper on racist hate speech in the Communication Methodologies class in the Spring of 2000. I also say "thank you so much" to Dr. Laura Umphrey for agreeing to read my thesis in her first semester as Assistant Professor in Communication. Finally, I am so obliged to the entire Department of Communication – students, staff, and professors – to say "thank you all" for being nice, helpful, and understanding.

Understanding the Lived Experience of Racist Hate Speech on American University Campuses

Chapter 1

Introduction

The purpose of this research is to understand the lived experience of students who have been the objects of hate speech, particularly racist hate speech. From a general point of view, hate speech is an expression that is abusive, insulting, intimidating, harassing, and which may lead to violence, hatred, or discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation (Hemmer, 1996). Hate speech has been typically accounted for as the result of cultures clashing and merging, and for several decades it has been the most difficult free speech question in America.

Hate speech and racism are highly correlated. Racism is "the expression of the ideology of racial inferiority which has been central to our constitutional and popular culture" (Greene, 1995, p. 32). Van Dijk (1993) gives another definition of racism that is central to this research:

> racism does not consist of only supremacist ideologies of race, or only of aggressive overt and blatant discriminatory acts, the forms of racism as it is currently understood in informal conversations, in the media, or in much of the social sciences. Racism also involves the everyday, mundane, negative opinions, attitudes, and ideologies and the seemingly subtle acts and conditions of discrimination against minorities, namely, those social cognitions and social acts, processes,

> structures, or institutions that directly or indirectly contribute to the dominance of the white group and the subordinate position of minorities. (p. 5)

Racist hate speech implies that words as well as actions play a key role in a regime of separation and subordination. At the core of racist hate speech is the dilemma of whether a democratic society in the 21st century should tolerate expression that is insulting, demeaning, and insensitive to human beings. It is an ongoing controversy in American society, with special meanings for the workplace, but also for universities where respect for others and a tolerant atmosphere are an expectation of high value. A number of universities have reacted to racist acts by adopting codes and policies that prohibit racist expressions on campus. A complication is that Caucasian persons may also be victims of racist hate speech, primarily in settings (i.e., educational institutions) where people are from various ethnic backgrounds.

Literature Review

The Context

Racist hate speech has existed in the United States since the foundation of the country. In the era of slavery, the White majority used racist talk towards ethnic minorities. Some American citizens even then were embarrassed and ashamed of these frank demonstrations of hate. Most people seemed to understand that words as well as actions played a key role in a regime of separation and subordination. They also knew that certain words were audible reminders of an ideology of racial

supremacy, and that such language signaled a rejection to the ideal of equality (Leo, 2000). People were clear about racist hate speech. It was the expression of the ideology of racial superiority which had been central to much of the popular culture (Greene, 1995). Over time, more and more judges ruled that racially hostile environments (i.e., in universities) violate the law.

Later, in the 1920s, local and state governments tried to suppress the activities and publications of various racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic groups. Supporters of censorship argued that racism, such as bigoted speech, tends to cause violence and disorder. The censors' arguments were especially strong in the '30s, when fascist organizations staged deliberately provocative demonstrations. Mindful of the tactics that had brought Hitler to power, advocates of anti-fascist measures argued that Nazis should not be permitted to take advantage of the civil liberties they would destroy once they were in charge. Opponents, including the ACLU, drew a different lesson from Nazi Germany: that constitutional rights are the best guarantee against tyranny and the best protection for members of minority groups (Sublum, 1994).

Now, at the turn of the 21st century, racist events such as the 1990s burnings of buildings belonging to Black churches and African Americans generally in the Southern United States have made hate expression again a national issue. In the beginning of the year 1990, a wave of racist incidents, like the burning of a cross in an African-American family's yard by a group of White students who used racist slurs, as well as other incidents on college campuses, led some universities to develop sanctions against hate speech (Sublum, 1994). It was determined that students should

have a grasp of how words can be used as weapons (Heumann & Church, 1997). The term "hate speech" became widespread. Consequently, today it tends to be addressed as a campus issue with emphasis on speech codes. The debate over speech codes in colleges and universities centers on two conflicting goals: the need to guarantee free speech, and the desire to limit racist hate speech in order to guarantee equal educational opportunities.

Hate speech codes: Definition

Hate speech codes are ethical codes established mostly by colleges and universities to regulate hate speech. There are two basic forms of hate speech codes. According to Hemmer (*Hate speech codes: The constitutionality issues*, 1996, p. 23), the first hate speech code is simply called "protected expression." The First Amendment of the Constitution allows citizens to express themselves. However, American colleges do not adopt a word-for-word interpretation of the Amendment. Rather, they impose boundaries (e.g., one cannot make a speech, in front of an audience, that is directed against Blacks). The second form of hate speech code deals with "fighting words." It punishes words, such as insults, that (1) demean or injure the sensibilities of a victim, and (2) have potential to produce physical retaliation. "Fighting words" must not only offend the person, they must also be capable of moving persons to physical aggression.

Are hate speech codes accepted by everyone?

Hate speech codes are accepted by the majority of the American population, yet some people reject them. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), for

instance, has always strongly defended freedom of speech, including speech that expresses or advocates discrimination (Strossen, 1997). In fact, the ACLU opposes hate speech codes that go beyond the traditional First Amendment interpretation of the freedom of speech. They support the idea that speech codes should not be introduced because they violate the student's right to free speech. Free speech belongs to everyone, they argue, and everyone has the right to be obnoxious and wrong. In addition, it is believed that existing criminal laws against discrimination and university expulsion policies are sufficient to deal with hate crimes. Finally, by imposing such codes, the university thereby denies itself the ability to go out into the forum and debate and denounce this type of behavior.

What are the possibilities to fight racist hate speech?

American colleges and universities have an affirmative obligation to combat racism and a responsibility to provide equal opportunities through education. To address these responsibilities, there may be alternatives to speech codes:

- to develop plans aimed at reducing prejudice, responding promptly to incidents of discriminatory harassment,
- to establish new-student orientation programs and continuing counseling programs that enable students of different races to learn to live with each other outside the classroom,
- to pursue efforts to attract enough minorities to alleviate isolation and to ensure real integration and diversity in academic life, and

- to punish severely white students using racist talk by expelling them from the university.

From this range of options, we may conclude that there are several solutions to the problems of racist hate speech, especially in universities. Yet, we raise the question as to whether there is an absolute definition of racist hate speech, whether everybody shares the same opinion as to what it means, and whether people experience it differently. In spite of the endeavors of experts and officials to clearly identify racist hate speech and reduce it, we may find that ethnic minority members consider this problem differently from Whites.

The distinction between ethnic minorities and Whites as to what they consider to be racist hate speech

Roughly, hate speech is a form of racism using abusive and discriminatory talk, mostly toward members of a minority group. There seems to be a question as to whether there are clear degrees or levels of "seriousness" of racist hate speech. The degree of its "seriousness," however, can never be absolute in that it is subjective; a matter of individual, personal feelings. Even straightforward political discourse about ethnic affairs may be somewhat hurtful to members of ethnic minorities. For instance, a comment by French president Jacques Chirac, in the everyday experience of French-speaking people, was recognized to be a significant derogatory remark in a speech when he said that he could well understand the resentment of ordinary white people being confronted with large and ill-smelling immigrant families from North Africa. Enoch Powell and Margaret Thatcher made comments on immigrants in the

United Kingdom which were also demeaning (Whillock & Slayden, 1995). While it may not be considered as hurtful by persons making such comments, ethnic minority members might not view such comments as laudatory. If two Europeans in a bus say that Arabs are *not well-educated* in a normal conversation without intending to demean Arabs, they may still hurt an Arab person's feelings if he or she overhears the conversation. If the same two Europeans in the bus tell jokes in which Arabs are the butts of the joke (i.e., "Did you know that Jean-Marie Lepen, a French extreme right leader, has Arab blood though... Yes, man, on the front bumper of his car"), they would probably offend him or her. Needless to say, calling an Arab person a *religious fundamentalist* or *barbarian* face-to-face will certainly raise his or her anger. Depreciating a person of color by conveying an indirect message can also be harmful. For example: an Anglo mother tells her son's new Asian girlfriend that business associates of their publishing company will not accept an interracial relationship. The message is clear: according to the mother, having a relationship with an Asian person would be "ill-considered." Though conversationally polite, she expresses racism in an indirect way, which may be almost as demeaning as a direct expression.

Racist hate speech can thus be conveyed by a direct or indirect message. Skinner (1996) classifies racist hate speech in two categories:

Direct messages	Indirect messages
1. Insults	1. Hidden racist messages
2. Hurtful remarks	2. Demeaning hints
3. Racist discourses	3. Analogies

4. Pejorative names

5. Jokes

Again, there remain the question as to whether racist hate speech is viewed the same way by everybody, as to whether any form of racist hate speech would be harmful to openly racist members of ethnic minorities like Khalid Abdul Muhammad, and as to whether it would be harmful to apathetic minority members. It certainly depends on the delivery, the context, and the feelings of the individual. But even though we know that ethnic minorities are sensitive to racist talk, there is no evidence to support the assumption that their sensitiveness is similar to that of Whites. Furthermore, we can, without data, hardly argue that some of people targeted really feel more hurt than a sensitive White person might, or that they differ in what they consider to be racist hate speech.

Case Studies

Two case studies show how deep the use of racist hate speech can be in contemporary society. In the first case study, Heumann and Church (1997) report that a White person was fined $200 for having used hurtful words towards Black persons. In Illinois, a male politician, said: "To halt the further encroachment, harassment and invasion of White people, their property, neighborhoods, and persons, by the Negro…" and "if persuasion and the need to prevent the White race from becoming mongrelized by the Negro will not unite us, then the aggressions… rapes, robberies, knives, guns, and marijuana of the Negro, surely will" (p. 81). Illinois has been the scene of tension between races, often leading to violence and destruction.

In the second case study, the same authors report that in 1990, Brown University, Rhode Island, expelled a freshman student on the grounds of certain racist, sexist, homophobic, and anti-Semitic slurs he made months earlier. In a dormitory, the student, with two comrades, saw an Israeli flag hanging in a dorm room and they began to shout, "Are you Jewish? Fucking Jew!" The authors note that "After this exchange, the unidentified freshman, who was later confirmed to be Jewish, ran into the hallway and asked two friends to join him in following the three men. A second confrontation, less clear in detail, ensued" (Heumann & Church, *Hate speech on campus*, 197, p.152). The student argued he could not see the connection between calling someone a "fucking Jew" and anti-Semitism. Such incidents had already occurred earlier during his freshman year at Brown. One occurred during an argument at a fraternity party when he used racist words towards a Black student.

From these two examples, we may conclude that the racist hate speech was seen to convey a direct message (that is, insults and hurtful remarks) toward an ethnic minority member. The social malaise of hate speech, however, also concerns White Americans. For instance, the Nation of Islam has enormous power on the racial scene. One of its famous leaders, Elijah Muhammad, was known for his speeches targeting Whites. He propounded a theory of Black racial superiority, that the White race was an offshoot of the Black race, and that a separate state should be created for Black America. The Nation of Islam has continued its racist messages through Louis Farrakhan, present leader of the Black Muslim movement who has already gathered hundreds of thousands of new members.

Effects of racist hate speech

Ninety percent of victims of racist hate speech are members of ethnic minorities. Ten percent are Caucasians (Somner, 1998). It is also reported that 20 percent of ethnic minority members regularly encounter face-to-face insults (Somner, 1998). The consequences can be disastrous. Racist speech damages the dignity and psyches of its victims. When severe, it can even cause physical sickness, including high blood pressure, tremors, sleep disturbance, and early death (Leo, 2000). Further, some "Black" schools and universities (i.e., Howard University and several universities on the East coast) may harm ethnic minority students, in that, when they leave their university, they will have a more acute experience of racist speech because most of the students of their educational institution are of the same ethnic origin (Somner, 1998). Concerning the "regular" universities (i.e., state universities) where people from many origins study, speech codes would attempt to discourage racism and, therefore, reduce racist talk.

Thus, racist hate speech mostly concerns ethnic minority members, but also may affect Caucasians. The issue to be researched here is the human experience of racist hate speech in order to determine what the nature of that experience may be, and how broadly the experience may be shared.

Virtually anyone can be a victim of hate speech. Therefore, what is interesting to know is whether or not there may be some human experience of hate speech that transcends ethnicity and race. This research is an exploratory study soliciting

narratives of the experience of hate speech from a range of people and ethnicities to better understand the nature of the human experience.

Chapter 2

Methodology

Description of research

This research employs narrative methodology, and data were collected via conversational interviewing, following closely the procedures described by Kvale (1996). As Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, and Zilber (1998) point out, "the use of narrative methodology results in unique and rich data that cannot be obtained from experiments, questionnaires, or observations" (p. 9). The narrative approach is based on the evidence that human beings organize their realities narratively, that is, we reify our lived realities by telling stories. The stories people tell of their lived experience are both why and how that experience becomes meaningful. As Polkinghorne (1988) writes:

> Narrative provides a framework for understanding the past events of one's life and for planning future actions. It is the primary scheme by means of which human existence is rendered meaningful. Thus, the study of human beings by the human sciences needs to focus on the realm of meaning in general, and on narrative meaning in particular (p. 11).

Conversational Interviewing

Narratives were produced from conversational interviewing. Kvale (1996) calls for seven stages in the interview process: thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analyzing, verifying, and reporting (p. 88) and suggests that this type of

research normally uses "15 ± 10 co-researchers" (p. 105). After practicing the techniques of the craft, co-researchers were interviewed about their lived experience of racist hate speech, and solicited that experience in conversation – structured to produce their experience as their "stories." The interviewees had stories about what they encountered in their lives. In order to generate response to my overall interest, I made sense of the co-researchers' stories in regard to the lived experience of being targeted for the communication of hate.

Interview process

Kvale's seven stages of interview investigation were thoroughly followed. The research goal was to collect personal narratives of persons who suffered racist hate speech, from guiding a close and intimate conversation with the interviewees. According to Kvale (1996), the interview is a specific form of conversation based on everyday life and yet is a professional conversation which has structure and purpose. It goes beyond the spontaneous exchange of views as in mundane conversation, and becomes a careful questioning and listening approach with the purpose of obtaining thorough knowledge. The other purpose is to obtain descriptions of the lived world of the interviewees with respect to interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena.

The research interview is not a conversation between equal partners. It is asymmetrical because the researcher defines and controls the situation. The topic of the interview is introduced by the researcher, who also critically follows the narrative of the co-researcher and directs discussion toward the experience to be understood. In

order to conduct in-depth interviews, the researcher has to live within the interview experience, both participating in and directing the conversation at the same time. The outcome of the interviews depended on my knowledge, sensitivity, and empathy (as research tool). Reflexivity also played a part at every stage of this research. Because the researcher is the research tool, everything that happens in the research reflects the researcher's thinking. Reflexivity implies that the researcher is mindful of all the other stages at the same time; that one pays continual, extraordinary attention. Being the researcher is a saturated role ranging from the most general perspective of the entire project to the most minute focus on the moment of the interview, all permeated by the researcher's own experience of the phenomenon.

The first segment of an in-depth interview is spent by the co-researchers getting to know each other. The general experiential topic is introduced in the first few minutes, beginning with broad questions and then focusing upon the subject progressively. Probing questions are used to guide the direction of the co-researcher's conversational explication. The researcher must attend the narrative of the interviewee as his or her interest will always be partly different from the co-researcher's. A reciprocal level of interpersonal relationship was needed. I volunteered my "self," and the more "self" was put into the process, the more relaxed the subject became. Both my co-researchers and I were allowed to volunteer information, bearing in mind that we both shared and shaped the space together. In addition to this, observation is important. Observation is a key skill while interviewing, thus the researcher must be a good listener, encouraging, showing

interest, and concern. Non-verbal is the first line of contexting the verbal. Non-verbal messages did appear in the conversation: emotional cues such as a tense voice, giggling, and nervous laughter. Therefore, as researcher, I needed to have a good understanding of the participant's world going into the interview so that I could note the nonverbal aspects in anticipation of the transcription process.

The interviews were audio-taped with a small recorder placed between the interviewee and the researcher, so that I could then concentrate on the topic and the dynamics of the interview. The transcription process involves translating from an oral language, with its own set of rules, to a written language, with another set of rules (Kvale, 1996). By analyzing the final capta, after the interviews were transcribed, I evaluated the coherence, logic, and comprehensibility of the stories of each interviewee in great depth. The manner in which the narratives were analyzed will be discussed later in this chapter. All the interviews took place on campus. The interview sessions started in June 2001 and ended in October of the same year. Creating the transcription of each interview took between four and six hours each, and served as part of the process of saturated listening.

Finally, for the protection of the interviewees, and for the ethical issues inherent to every research project involving human subjects, I assured them that their identities will remain anonymous through the use of pseudonyms and that they would have access to the written texts of my research before I submitted it to graduate school.

Identifying Interviewees

Another task in this research was to identify potential subjects. This was not easy given the nature of the experience to be studied. Most narrative studies are conducted with smaller groups of individuals than in traditional research, but the quantity of data gathered in narratives is large. In the selection of participants, I considered a range of ages, ethnicities, genders, class backgrounds, areas, and so on. We should be aware of the fact that all these characteristics are important in the context of this study.

Gender

Gender differences are important. Women who are victims of racist hate speech tell different stories than do men. They also have a different view of this social malaise.

Age

Age is very important in this context. Young people are more likely to be victims of racist hate speech than older people.

Ethnicity

Another important aspect, as mentioned earlier, people from all ethnic backgrounds may be victims of racist hate speech: Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians, Caucasians, etc. A significant question emerges: if an equal number of people from all ethnic backgrounds told their stories about their experiences of racist hate speech, what would their narratives be like? In what ways would they differ? This is an important research focus for a narrative study.

Comparing the narratives of victims of racist hate speech from different ethnic backgrounds was interesting and insightful.

Class backgrounds

People with a high level of education may provide narratives different from people with low or no education. However, this study did not address this issue.

Region

The kinds of narratives may vary from region to region, where racism is not viewed the same way and where experiences may be different.

Finding Interviewees

Finding interviewees was an important matter in this research. Certainly the studied experience exists in universities, but also in some workplaces where people are from different backgrounds. Interviewing a Black person in the military and going to the Multicultural Center or to any organization that represents minority groups were two major steps that I wanted to take. These organizations could conceivably point me to those who have suffered racist hate speech. Unfortunately, this was to no avail. I knew that Alaskan Natives are victims of racist hate speech sometimes and their stories might contribute a lot to my research, but the concern was whether or not they would be willing to talk about those experiences.

One procedure to gain interviewees consisted of writing a cover letter to the Alaskan Native Center. The letter was not long, about one page, and made it clear how the interviewees could get in touch with me. The letter also told why this research was important and how the information would be used. Finally, the letter

explained that interviewees would remain anonymous and that participation in the research was voluntary.

A second procedure was to do a "call" in all Communication classes (Comm 131X and Comm 141X) for volunteers who had experienced racist hate speech. This process increased my interviewees since there are many sections of these classes taught on campus.

The lived experience as a researcher

Self-awareness and self-discipline are required in narrative research. The researcher is the research tool, who studies lived experience and describes the co-researched experience as we live through it. Studying the problem of racist hate speech is not context-free. We are part of a shared reality. We create that reality as we live it and reflect upon it. The researcher also must address his or her own experience.

It should be added that, as a European, I have a different perspective of the topic than do members of the American culture. Racist hate speech is not understood the same way socially in Europe and is not directed toward the same categories of people. In final analysis, I determined how my own experience affects the research and, in interpreting the capta, acknowledged the effects of my own cultural perspective.

Analysis of the narratives

Kvale suggests six steps of research, each with its own type of analytic reasoning (*InterView*, p. 89):

1) The subjects describe their lived world during the interview.

2) The subjects themselves discover new relationships during the interview and see new meanings in what they experience. They start to see new meanings in their life worlds on the basis of the descriptions of the interviewer.
3) During the interview, the researcher condenses and interprets the meaning of what the interviewee describes, and sends the meaning back, which enables the interviewee to modify his or her statements. The dialogue continues until there is only one interpretation of the statement left.
4) The transcribed interview is interpreted by the researcher: to structure the material, the researcher clarifies the material to make it amenable to analysis, for instance by eliminating all the digressions and repetitions. Finally, in the analysis proper, the researcher elaborates the meanings of the interview using one of five approaches to the analysis of meaning (i.e., meaning condensation, meaning categorization, narrative structuring, meaning interpretation, and generating meaning through ad hoc methods).
5) Re-interviewing is a possible fifth step. The researcher may give the interpretations back to the subjects in order to receive comments on researcher interpretations of the narratives.
6) The researcher may extend the continuum of description and interpretation to include action.

Analysis was an omnipresent process throughout the research. A final analysis was then made of the transcribed material. That final analysis produced the

significant themes found in the interview capta. The result of the analytic processes is the interpretation of the capta.

Chapter 3

Description of the capta

Participants in this research are students who have experienced racist hate speech at, at least, one American university in the course of their studies. This chapter describes the capta gathered in the interviews done for this research.

The search for participants was begun in the Office of Rural Students' Services (RSS), with the hope that the staff there could provide help in locating victims of racist hate speech since that Office mainly deals with rural Alaskan students who are mostly Natives. After several weeks, that Office claimed that "victims of racist hate speech are much harder to find in a university setting as they are smart enough and do not insult each other any more." Amazed and puzzled by that response, but undaunted, I pursued my search, and gained permission to speak directly with undergraduate students in many Communication service classes. I made a two-minute presentation of my research interest at the beginning of most Communication 131X and 141X classes, two university core curriculum classes attended by students at UAF, and in some other upper-level Communication classes. I explained the goals of my study, what kind of participants I needed, and how they could contact me if interested in participating. Soon a first student contacted me for an interview. Transcribing was accomplished as soon after the interviews as possible. When I had done a few interviews, I began describing the transcribed narratives.

I immediately sensed that racist hate speech on American campuses and universities is different from that on Belgian campuses and universities (and even

other European academic places). Being a Belgian student, I had to adjust my thinking based in my background and experience of racist hate speech with the American forms of racism. In Europe it is more implicit and takes the form of physical avoidance rather than overt verbal aggression or racist words. I learned much about racist hate speech on American university campuses from the research interviews.

Those co-constructed narratives rely upon the voices of individuals with various ethnic backgrounds and experiences regarding racist hate speech on university campuses. Each story and each experience is unique. "Lucy" experienced racist hate speech at a Southwestern university. "Jane," "Junior," and "Bill" experienced racism at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. "Raul" encountered such a situation at a Southeastern university. The narrative of "Lucy," my first interviewee, is also the first one described.

Description of Research Interview with "Lucy"

Lucy is a 22-year old female student at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. She is Caucasian, fluent in Spanish, and majors in History and Russian Studies. Between the Fall of 1997 and the Spring of 1999, Lucy was a student at the University of New Mexico and carried a double major in Accounting and International Business Administration. During those years, Lucy recounts experiencing racist hate speech from Hispanic people.

The interview took place in my dormitory room, and was my first research interview. As a researcher, I manipulated and controlled the conversation, but in the

beginning, I asked her too many questions instead of allowing her to tell her story. I asked her many questions because I thought she did not totally understand the purpose of my research. I wanted to guide her in the right direction. However, as the interview progressed, she told her story without any interruption on my part.

I also distracted myself and Lucy by taking notes during the early part of the interview and did not listen carefully enough to Lucy. My attention to method improved progressively from the second interview on.

Lucy remembers first being called names related to her skin color rather than other types of insults. She acknowledges not paying too much attention to those forms of harassment:

> Everything that people said to me, I just kind of brushed it off… I didn't get too many insults, but they would call me names… The reason for me it is hard to remember is that I didn't pay too much attention at that time, but I did experience what you called racist hate speech for sure. In that one instance, some Hispanic girls told me "You shouldn't be living here because you're White. You are on the wrong side of the tracks."

According to Lucy, racist hate speech in that part of New Mexico is expressed verbally, in an indirect or direct way, as opposed to Belgium, where it is not voiced in such a way, especially on a university campus. In the interview, Lucy smiled a lot. She has an articulate grasp of the English language. Unfortunately, even though her

enunciation is excellent for an international student, her grammar was sometimes difficult to follow.

The reason she chose to live among those Hispanic people, she says, was that the prices were low. On the way to the University of New Mexico – she actually lived 15 minutes away from campus – she recalls encountering threatening statements: "You shouldn't walk around here, White girl, because you gonna get yourself into some problems."

She acknowledges having heard "tons of hurtful remarks" in regard to her being White. However, she recalls experiencing less racist hate speech on campus than on the way to campus. She explained that perpetrators would be easily expelled from that university if they expressed offending voices toward students who belong to another ethnic background. In addition, she was very descriptive of what she thinks a minority is:

> Not that you have only eight minorities, the minorities are just considered minorities because they are different from you, not because they are fewer in numbers. I mean, the minorities aren't necessarily fewer in numbers, on the contrary.

I asked Lucy if she experienced racist insults in Spanish since the perpetrators were Hispanic. Her answer was "Yes" and she gave me several words in Spanish, that she remembers having heard, that were directed towards her:

> **Jueda** and **Gringa**. **Jueda** is like an insult for White foreigner. **Gringa** for White girl… They don't say it in English. If they would

> say White girl, they prefer to use Spanish, that's their native language. They knew I understand Spanish but they wanted to convey that I shouldn't be there, you know, that I'm not in the part I should be. I took flamenco for a while and they were saying like "Oh you dance pretty good for a White girl. You shake your butt pretty good for a White girl."

Lucy also told me that Hispanic students assume White students have better grades and that most Hispanic people do not go beyond high-school. Furthermore, she said, on campus they do not hold a conversation with Caucasians if they start talking bad about them:

> They're not gonna spend some time to sit with you talking. They would not converse with you, so you gonna get more of the passer-by stuff and it's the same stuff over and over again. It's not a huge variety of jokes or insults, it's just that you shouldn't be there.

I asked how she reacted to those forms of racist hate speech. In the beginning, she recounts, she ignored it as she was walking in front of 7 or 10 boys. After a while, she said she felt angry and confronted them with statements like "You guys ain't cool." She acknowledges disliking living among them and taking the same road every day. Finally, I asked if she reported what she experienced to school officials. Her answer was quick and straight to the point, a resounding "NO."

> No, you know, reporting that kind of thing to any kind of school official, police, or anything, would not do you any good. When there is

> such a problem, you just have to move. And that's what they would tell you, the police cannot do anything about it. It's a different situation. These people, they have large groups of friends and if you start making their life difficult, they will be on your case. Just let it go. If you have the cops go to their house because of stuff like that, I guarantee that the next day you will have more problems. It doesn't even enter your mind to report it. You don't mess with them and you'll be fine.

Lucy ended our interview by saying that her life at the University of Alaska Fairbanks is much easier as she has never experienced racism and that she would take any form of racist hate speech at UAF as a joke.

Description of Research Interview with "Jane"

I spent the first five minutes of interaction getting to know Jane personally, which immediately created a good atmosphere in the research setting for the next thirty minutes. Jane is an eighteen-year old student at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. She is genetically Caucasian and Alaska Native. She was born and raised in Alaska, living in Valdez for several years before moving to Fairbanks. Her parents were in the Army and were stationed in Belgium before their retirement. Jane's Alaska Native origin stems from her mother, who was raised in Kotzebue, a village on the West coast of Alaska. Her father is Caucasian. Jane is soft spoken and is very articulate. She has brown eyes and her blond hair is always very neat. Jane smiles frequently, yet she remains quite poised and focused. She seemed especially so when

she was being interviewed. Her voice was lowered, but full of significant emphasis and emotion.

In this second interview, in comparison with the first, with Lucy, I honed my craftsmanship as a researcher as I began with broad questions and then focused upon the subject progressively instead of starting the conversation by asking detailed questions. I used probing questions to guide the direction of the co-researcher's conversational explication. I opened the interview proper saying: "Jane, tell me your story, what happened to you?" Prodding questions were in forms such as: "How did you react? Did you tell officials" I ended the interview by asking her "Do you want to add anything to the story?" She said that she did not.

Jane recounts sitting on a bench at a Hall in the center of campus with three other female students, "also Natives." They were studying and enjoying a beautiful, sunny day at the beginning of September 2001. They were surrounded by many people, among whom were four boys and three girls who she said appeared to be between 18 and 23. This group walked past and started laughing and making demeaning comments at the ethnic background of Jane's group. One of offending voice she recalls quite vividly: "You damned, drunk Natives… You all should not be allowed on campus."

Jane says that these students kept making other racist remarks of the same sort, saying in effect that Natives don't deserve to live. The first response from Jane and her three friends, she recalls, was brief and was her own: "Everyone has the right to an education and everyone has the right to live."

Jane was hurt by that event and volunteered that it "hurt her feelings." The worst was yet to come. A few days later, the same group of friends was sitting at the same place and some of the same students sat right across from them for about an hour. "I really knew they would sit there the whole time," Jane acknowledges. This time, they were yelling loud enough so that Jane's group could hear every racist insult voiced:

> Natives are all fat, they all get pregnant when they're young, they're all drunk. All Natives should be wiped out. America is filled with worthless people like Natives… Natives are worthless, they are a down on our economy, all they do is drink, make babies.

Hearing Jane's narrative, I was affected as a researcher coming from a place where this would certainly not happen on a campus. Jane adds that it hurt her feelings even more as she felt that these racist events made all the witnesses turn around and look at her group as people who did not belong. Some witnesses were laughing at the victims. Some of these witnesses tentatively stood up for the four girls, but most did not say anything. Rather, they walked away without reacting to the hurtful comments on how small Native villages should all be shut down and made into White cities. It was hurtful to her, especially because most of the witnesses said and did nothing:

> Other people didn't say anything, they laughed at it, other people, I mean, there were other people who stood up for us, but they just said

> "Leave them alone" and walked away… Most people just laughed along with them, that was really hurtful.

Jane's voice is more and more inconsistent as the interview goes on. The way she talks and moves sounds to me as if she is still emotionally shocked by what she experienced. At this point, however, she makes a clarification on how she responded to the second round of racist insults on her origins: "I am Native, I am proud to be Native, it's not something I'm ashamed of, and even though I don't look it, that's my heritage, I'm Irish and I'm Native and there's nothing I can do about it."

By describing her looks and her origins, she makes the point that she is Native and will remain Native for the rest of her life: "This is who we are and we can't change, there is no way we can change who we are."

The students referred to Jane as a "White girl," responding to her Caucasian genetics and blond hair. After her second experience of racist hate speech on campus, Jane recounts that she and her three friends just left and went home. She acknowledges having cried, being "disgusted" and "demolished" in learning that "people are so cruel." She went upstairs to her room, talking with her Native friends about how people can be so mean, so racial: "It is as much here about racism against Natives as it is about racism against Blacks or Mexicans." Besides hurtful remarks and racist insults, she also remembers having heard demeaning jokes: "How do you call a Native? That's easy, you yell out "Beer!"

Jane often grinned during the interview, which turned the conversation into an intimate face-to-face encounter between a researcher and a victim who had been

willing to defend her rights. In addition, it seems to me that she knows the problem of racism very well as she was also moved to write a research paper on the topic. Her description of reality is significant: in spite of the stereotype that homeless, drunk Natives abound in the downtown area of the city in which the university is located, Natives, she says, only make up 40% of such citizens; the rest being composed of other races, most of them Caucasians. According to Jane, there are other reasons that explain why she and her three friends were humiliated and insulted by these students. Besides the stereotyping, in their attitude towards Natives, she thinks that they were trying to be funny with each other; that tearing others down somehow builds them up. Jane does not stereotype in any sense, as she states: "They should look at everybody the same. I don't stereotype, I try not to judge people on how they look. Good people don't judge other people by any of that."

Jane spoke constantly and profusely, willing to tell everything she had in mind. Her narrative was contexted in a variety of non-verbal communication. Emotional cues included such matters as a tense voice, giggling, and nervous laughter. In addition, there were many verbal fillers such as "You know" and vocalic fillers like "uh," "um," and "err" which made her telling of her story choppy.

I asked her if when it was happening she wanted to retaliate or tell officials about what had happened. Jane did not file a complaint to officials of the University, but told her parents. Her brother and her boyfriend wanted to return to campus with her to "beat them up." She did not know who these people were, however, and did not think it would have changed what happened. Furthermore, Jane said she believed that

officials of the University could not have changed those students' attitudes even if the officials gave them a serious warning: "They'd still do it and just try not to get caught… They won't do it as openly but might still do it. I don't think anyone can change them."

At the end of the interview, Jane acknowledges that these hate speech events have changed her academic routine and that she would now come to the University only to be physically present in class or to check out a book from the library. She has decided "not to hang out" on campus except for academic purposes. Jane ended the interview by explaining her standards and principles as a person asserting her right to be respected and treated equally:

> If I saw somebody doing that to someone else of a different race, I would go up and I would stand up, I wouldn't care if I didn't know him… If I saw someone calling black people names, making fun of their race, religion, or culture, I would definitely stand up… I think that nobody should do that and if other people had stood up for us more, we would have been far better off. These people just walked away and a lot of them looked at us as if we were doing something wrong. It was just group cowardice and I couldn't believe how people could just laugh at that. I think that everybody has their right to their opinion, but really hurting somebody else's rights is wrong.

Jane's expectations of being treated equally and fairly as a human being also reflect how she feels she would respond if she were witnessing a racist hate speech situation happening to someone else.

Description of Research Interview with "Raul"

This interview marks a turning point in my conversation skills with co-researchers. I felt much more confident in myself. I did not drop my pen as I had a few times and, even though I had some sheets of paper to take notes, I barely made notes about what Raul said. Instead, I just listened carefully.

Raul is twenty years old and is currently enrolled as a student at UAF. He does not have major yet. He is originally from Alaska, but attended college classes (for one semester) in Florida two years ago, where he experienced racist hate speech. His family is from Equador and his genetics are visibly Hispanic. He is very expressive and spoke in a fast, inconsistent rate.

Raul recounts being in a party at Tampa Bay Community College when he was a freshman. He was accompanied by a Caucasian friend who accidentally bumped into a young male student whom Raul did not know. Offended, the student looked at Raul angrily, even though Raul was not responsible for the incident. According to Raul, the student immediately uttered racial comments towards him: "You don't deserve to be on this college here… You're family isn't smart enough."

Raul says he felt "put down as a person." He explains why the student's racist insults were geared towards him and not his Caucasian friend who was responsible for the incident:

> When you find yourself in Florida in the Miami area, you see a lot of Spanish people and the farther north you get, the more resentment, at least that's what I found, people of the north have for the Spanish people down south because they think they're taking their jobs there. I don't know why this kid was like this, but someone told me that his dad lost his job to a Spanish family… I think that was why he had resented Spanish people so much…He was also putting down my friend but, as he was also a White guy, he wasn't really saying anything racial towards him.

Raul believes that the source of the problematic situation stems from the attitude of the male student who insulted him:

> You know, some guys are really irritable and that's how he was. I think he thought I was just a Spanish guy and maybe I was an easy target. After that, he didn't say anything to my friend.

The goal of the student, says Raul, was to demean him simply because he is Hispanic and belongs to the Spanish community:

> It was like he was insulting the whole Spanish community. I'm trying to remember what else he said. It was just a whole bunch of cussing. He was just yelling at me… Basically, he just kept on saying that I wasn't smart enough…that Mexicans are ruining everything…

Here Raul's vocal rate becomes less and less steady. He begins to have more and more verbal and vocalic fillers. However, Raul continues to tell about his

experience and describes other occasions in which he was targeted. One of the insults, he remembers, was *spic*. "*Spic*," Raul says, is a stereotypical insult directed towards Spanish people, in the same way that Chinese people are called *Chinks*. I asked if he wanted to retaliate or tell officials of the University. Raul told me he did not want to have the person who insulted him punished. Furthermore, Raul says he did not want to report his experience to officials of the University because by not doing so he prevented the student from getting "into trouble:"

> I didn't want the other people to get mad at me… I didn't go bring it to officials because I had figured out that if I had told them, then this kid would have been so much into trouble or he would have wanted to fight even more.

Nor did Raul want to be involved in a fight with the racist perpetrator. During the event, Raul told me, he did not know what to say since he's not "the type of person to be involved in a fight." Raul said that in retrospect, he did not respond to the racism in the way he wanted to:

> I did want to retaliate, I did want to go back and fight him but my friend was telling me not to do it because there were only two of us and there like four of his friends with him, so it wouldn't have led us anywhere and they were drunk. I mean, when you're drunk, you can't control that anyway… We didn't get into a fight there because people then would have got into a fight too…My friend basically told me not to... I listened to him.

Following his friend's advice, he refrained from fighting. But Raul was also frustrated with the witnesses of this racist speech event because they did not react or show any support for him. The boys who were with the student were laughing, he recalls. Some people did not want to be involved and were "cowards." Other onlookers were telling the angry student to "beat him up;" encouraging a fight: "I guess, that does disappoint me, that people didn't jump and didn't do anything about it. Not necessarily to beat him up but just take him out of the place where the party was at."

Raul ends the interview by comparing the different Hispanic cultures. His comparison is intended to help me understand why in some parts of Florida, people express animosity towards Mexicans. People from Argentina, Equador, and Brazil, Raul says, do not think highly of Mexicans as they are seen as "dirty people." Raul knows "a lot of kids who don't like Mexicans." Spanish people, such as Cubans and Puerto-Ricans, he says, look down on Mexicans who are the butts of the jokes. The way they speak, he says, is "dirtier" than any other Spanish linguistic variance. This might explain why, Raul believes, the student insulted him.

In this interview with Raul, I learned much about racist hate speech, especially when he was describing Mexicans, who form one Spanish community, as the target of the other Spanish communities.

Description of Research Interview with "Junior"

Junior is an employee of Alyeska, a pipeline service company in Alaska. He does shift work. He works every day for two weeks and then has two weeks off. The

Alyeska branch where he is employed is located in Fairbanks. Junior grew up in a small village on the West Coast of Alaska with a population of 600. After working on his education for almost ten years, he earned a Bachelor's Degree in Electrical Engineering in the spring of 2000 from the University of Alaska Fairbanks. He is an Alaska Native, married, and has a two-year old son. Junior is deeply tanned beyond his Native skin tone, wears glasses, is poised, and has an articulate grasp of the English language. He was soft spoken during the interview. He spoke very slowly, with a lot of pauses.

In addition, the forty-three minutes I spent with Junior in the TA's office of the Department of Communication that one evening in October was the closest and most intimate conversation I had among all the interviewees. Junior says he experienced racist hate speech several times while he was an undergraduate student at the University.

Junior recounts having problems adapting himself to the size of the town in which the university is located, which even now he considers a big city, in comparison with his own small village. The town has a population of 60,000 people, which is roughly 100 times the population of his Native village. When he entered his very first class at college, he says, he felt totally lost. He believed that "people looked at him as if he did not belong there."

> It was quite an insane feeling. I persevered and stuck with it because I had a dream, that is to get my Bachelor's of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering and in the first year, the transition was a little

> rough, even out of the classroom when I went to the Commons to buy something to eat and you heard people's comments… comments such as: 'Oh, look at that Native.' The way they said it, the tone that they had said it, it seemed like they thought we did not belong.

It is the first time that an interviewee has talked about hostility towards a person belonging to a different ethnic background being expressed in the form of eye contact and body language; which are also evidently experienced as forms of racism. In addition, just as in the experience of the other interviewees, Junior expressed that he felt he was considered, by people of a different ethnic background – in this case, Caucasians – as unworthy of the right to belong to the academic world. Junior did not have any relatives who studied at the University. He was the only one to study there. During his sophomore year, one of his family members died and Junior recalls that he had to take a year and a half off. He came back in 1993. The following year, in 1994, Junior had his first personal and direct experience of racist hate speech at the University. He remembers waiting at a bus stop on campus with his cousin to go to the malls. Suddenly, he says, a car passed by and one of the people in the car – a man probably in his thirties, he remembers - shouted "You stupid Natives," then laughed and drove off. Junior says that it hurt his feelings:

> It wasn't based on who we were, it was just a passer-by making a crude remark. Of course, I was very angry and I even wanted to stop the car and say: 'Why did you say that? What do you have against

people of a different race?' There is no difference between us, even though we're a different race and culture.

Evidently, like other interviewees, Junior did not respond to these hate speech perpetrators exactly the way he wanted to. Unlike the other interviewees, he did not have the chance to respond at all. At that point during the interview, Junior began to cry, but continued speaking with a lowered voice and at a very inconsistent rate. The interview began to be a very deep questioning and listening approach with the purpose of obtaining thorough knowledge. From that moment, I tried to be an even more empathic listener and I volunteered my "self" into the conversation, encouraging, and showing interest and concern. Junior continued his story, explaining that he experienced other situations of hate speech. In 1999, the year of his son's birth, he recounts that he and his Native wife were at Hess Village, next to the University's only fraternity house, in the middle of the afternoon. When they were walking past the fraternity house, some of its members - probably between the ages of 18 and 25, he says - made comments about his wife because she looks Native: "They were making comments about her weight and how she looked like a big fat walrus and made some rude comments and vicious comments… My wife said "Just let it go."

Junior is putting a lot of "self" into the interview process. His voice is less tense and he appears to be more and more relaxed. He remembers experiencing another racist speech event. He says that when he held an internship at a university in Ohio, people thought he was Japanese or Chinese because Junior was told to "go

back" to China, his assumed home. They called him a "Chink." Junior wanted to retaliate and to express his feelings, but never had the opportunity:

> It just struck me that they could say such things even though they don't know who you are. I felt angered and wanted to tell them that they have no basis to say these remarks, they don't know who I am… I wanted to retaliate in all the cases but did not have a chance to. I did not, either could not or, in another case, my wife told me not to. I told my friends, my former faculty advisor, and other friends on campus.

He told me that he really agonized over these racist events. Even now, Junior is frustrated about the way Natives are treated and thinks hate speech towards Natives is based on racist stereotypes: "I believe that whatever they said must have been based on stereotypical data. It is the main reason… It's just a cultural gap… There is a loss of culture…"

Junior says he wants to confront people who express such racism and ask them why:

> I would tell myself that these people say these things but they can't base them on facts, they can't base their experiences with me… I'd still like to have the chance to actually go up and talk to them face-to-face and actually ask why. Why would a race be bad to a different culture? Just to make them feel more secure.

He also says that people who express racist hate do not understand how they can hurt people of ethnic minorities. "I don't think," he says, "people realize the

difficulties that are involved, how a single racist event can mark a person and the impact that they have done."

Junior ends the interview by making suggestions on how to educate students about racism and differing cultures. He thinks that there should be classes that deal with cultural differences. He thinks education should provide information on each culture so that students can be informed. He advocates organizing forums to discuss these racist experiences, that anyone may have, and to bring them forward into the light:

> They would actually get a sense of how it has either hurt them or changed them. That has to start somewhere… At this age, where the United States is so advanced, technology-wise, it is so lacking in humanitarian areas, it lacks the human sense, I think we need to start there and maybe at college have a class that deals with racism.

Junior says he attended two such classes offered by the Alyeska company, where people belonged to different cultures: Caucasians, Natives, African-Americans, Asians, and others. He says it was an "eye-opener" on racism in the working place. In addition, Junior acknowledges that, today, having had those classes, if he were to respond to racist hate speech perpetrators, he would respond to them in a more positive fashion.

By the time the interview was over, Junior told me he personally felt a lot better that he had shared his experiences of racist hate speech with me.

Description of Research Interview with "Bill"

Bill is my last interviewee. I feel that, as a researcher, both my understanding of my topic and my skills at this study have improved tremendously in the sense that I have a much better grasp of racist hate speech, at least from an American perspective, from the stories and information provided by my co-researchers. I move to make Bill feel very comfortable as soon as he enters the office where the interview is to be conducted. I show a smiling face and ask him how he is doing.

Bill is a 23-year old African American student at the University. His major is in Elementary Education. He is tall, athletic, and is a former player on the University basketball team. Bill experienced racist hate speech in 1997 and 1998 at the University.

He recounts driving one night in the Fall of 1997, on the back side of campus. He was only 19, but was the owner of a big, black 1980 Cadillac. A police car began to follow him and after a while pulled him over. Unfortunately, Bill did not have his driver's license with him, but had his driver's license number as well as his social security number. The policeman, a Caucasian, called his colleagues who promptly came to the location where Bill was pulled over. Finally, he had to spend an hour with them answering questions and taking a sobriety test. He recounts feeling that he was being profiled and unnecessarily detained:

> I ended up telling them this was harassment and that they were taking this too far… they said I crossed the yellow line when I made my turn, that's why they gave me the ticket… By the time I got to leave, they

> wrote me a ticket for not having my driver's license… it was horrible, it didn't make sense.

His experience with the campus police was far from being over. After having sued the policemen for harassment and abuse of power, Bill experienced a similar situation a year later with the same policemen. While watching a game at the University basketball court, a place where he used to work, Bill remembers witnessing one of the on-duty officers spraying pepper spray on an African American man for trespassing. He defended the man and told the policeman that it was not necessary to spray a toxic chemical product in a public area as people were starting to cough and choke. After the other man was arrested, the police came back to arrest Bill himself. Immediately, the policeman pushed him against the wall and reached into his pocket as if, he says, "I was a Black drug dealer who carries drugs and cell phones":

> So here's your pager, here's your cell phone, where are your drugs?

Bill replied he did not have drugs, but was arrested and taken into custody. The people who witnessed what was happening to Bill were supportive: "Everyone was saying 'Why are you arresting him, what are you doing, why are you taking him to jail?'"

In an effort to gain some support, Bill talked to school officials and asked for help. Unfortunately, he says, they did nothing for him. At that time, he was taking a class attended by many hockey players, most of whom he had thought of as his friends. Bill recounts experiencing demeaning jokes from them about his arrest and,

later, the public notice that was published in the newspaper: "There was a whole bunch of hockey players in there, everyone kept giving me a hard time and teasing me about the arrest. I tried to withdraw from that class."

Clearly, the experience of being accused of drug dealing for no reason other than his being African American was a damaging experience for Bill. Even years later, one can hear and see the emotion he carries with the memory.

Bill sensed such a lack of support from the University and his peers that he felt he had to withdraw. However, the University officials blocked his withdrawal from class and he ended up getting an "F" in that class. Consequently, Bill sued the University and the University Police Department (for the second time). Unfortunately, the main witness at the incident, a city policeman who had moved to Japan, was not there to act as a witness for him. The judge decided to drop the case and Bill felt that his attempt to have the policeman found guilty of his actions was to no avail.

Bill says he is still affected by his two experiences in 1997 and 1998 at the University. After those situations, he still feels harassed by those policemen and wants to retaliate:

> I suffered from that emotionally. I still get worked up every time I see those guys. When I came back from my trip, I was on campus, I came to check my email at the computer lab and one of the cops followed me and I got into my car and he said 'What are you doing back in

> town?' It was obvious they were harassing me, trying to get me to react, that still bothers me, I still want some kind of revenge.

Bill is horrified by what he experienced and evidently wants justice to be served as he thinks that the policemen did not receive the reprimand they deserved:

> I think that they should suffer the kind of reprimand, you know, they deserve some kind of reprimand. The campus police here are horrible… the way they stereotyped me, by the way I look. Those guys are horrible.

Narrative Summary

The narratives here discuss aspects of how individuals experience racist hate speech. The description of capta addresses the experience of racism on university campuses. Lucy faced racist hate speech many times when she was a student at the University of New Mexico. Jane and Bill each had two experiences on the same campus. Raul's experience was in Florida, whereas Junior had several experiences at different locations, both associated with universities. From the narratives, readers can see what forms racist hate speech may take: the form of racist words, hurtful remarks, demeaning jokes, stereotypical hints, aggressive eye contact, rude body gestures, and even threatening suggestions. The co-researchers belong to different, distinct ethnic backgrounds: Caucasian, Caucasian/Native, Hispanic, Alaska Native, and African American. This variety of ethnic backgrounds provided valuable information to my study. Racist hate speech was experienced and seen from different perspectives. The interview sessions show each story to be experientially different and unique.

However, common and consistent themes emerged among all the interviews. These recurrent themes are discussed in the next chapter, as interpretation of the capta.

Chapter 4

Interpretation of the capta

The descriptions of the co-constructed research narratives have raised the question of how common hate speech events are on college campuses in the United States. Racist hate speech is defined here as any form of expression deemed offensive to any racial or ethnic group. It is a message of disparagement and is often hateful and degrading; taking the form of an insult or a derogatory remark (Walker, 1997). Racist hate speech is discursive discrimination. It occurs when a person is degraded based on his or her race, skin color, national origin, or ethnic origin (Greenawalt, 2000). The experiential narratives make evident that racism is not something one can experience and feel ambiguous about. The narratives of the co-researchers were universally presented with a heightened flow of associated emotion. The individual experiences were recounted to the researcher with both verbal and nonverbal indicators of pain, indignation, and frustration.

It is unclear whether racist hate speech is growing on American college campuses or if its extent has never been understood. In those settings, students are often confronted with issues of difference and race, and such issues may be more omnipresent to experience in the educational setting than in other settings. Individuals or groups that have been targeted by racist hate speech feel an understandable outrage. On campuses, fears, tensions, and conflicts spawned by insults and racial stereotyping create an environment inimical to learning, especially if the victims sense a lack of support from their peers and/or university officials. The narrative of

Bill clearly illustrates this frustrating situation. Feeling a lack of support from some of his friends and particularly from the officials of the University in light of a hate speech event, Bill felt compelled to drop a class in which he was enrolled, was not allowed to do so, and eventually received an "F" for the course. The narratives show that racial stereotyping and the subsequent alienation by the experience still occur because of racist hate speech events on American college campuses. In response, many universities have adopted policies that address racism by placing restrictions on speech.

While people seem to think that "hate has no medicine" (African proverb) and "hate creates more hate" (Henry Dumas), others believe that one should "turn the other cheek;" suffer an injustice rather than commit one. Thus, there are divergent opinions on how to react to racism, particularly to racist hate speech. However, even though we now have considerable generic information on the subject, we have known very little about the lived experience of hate speech. The result of narrative research is an interpretation of lived experience that finds common themes in the experience of co-researchers. This chapter is a derivation of the themes found in the lived experience of hate speech.

In the previous chapter, working from transcriptions of the research interviews, I created a detailed account of the lived experience of each interviewee. In this chapter, as researcher, I provide the voice of integration. Because as a "foreign" student I have shared the experience of discursive discrimination and shared also in

the co-creation of the research interviews, my interpretation takes on a sense of expertise.

As stated above, analysis is a continuous part of methodological concurrency in conversationial interview research. According to Denzin (1989), narrative analysis is:

> Descriptive realism, which is dialogic and polyphonic… it tells the native's stories in his or her own words. It allows interpretation to emerge from the stories that are told. It reveals the conflictual, contradictory nature of lived experience and suggests that no single story or interpretation will fully capture the problematic events that have been studied. (p. 136)

My objective in interpreting the capta is to find consistencies among interviews in the form of common themes in the descriptions, and to find or propose language that captures these themes. According to Lanigan (1988), the interpretation of capta:

> attempts to determine which parts of the description are essential and which are not… we want to find out exactly which parts of the experience are truly part of our consciousness and which parts are merely assumed… to isolate the object of consciousness-the thing, person, emotion, and so forth, that constitutes the experience we have. (p. 10)

A researcher must determine common themes among research narratives as emergent from the commonalties of the language and experiences of the co-researchers.

Indignation, then anger

"Racist hate speech is likely to provoke the average person to retaliation, and thereby cause a breach of the peace." – Reitinger, 1998

Anger implies a grievance and a desire for revenge or to punish in return, whereas indignation is provoked by what one considers shameful, unworthy or outrageous, but does not always imply retaliation. People who experience racist hate speech, who feel insulted and humiliated in front of other people, also express a thirst for justice. Comments from the capta confirm the interviewees' desire for justice to be served and for perpetrators to be stopped and somehow reprimanded. The experiences also express feelings of indignation, anger, alarm, and resentment. Some co-researchers even express a desire for revenge. Raul, for example, speaks of his unfulfilled desire to "retaliate" as one reaction to his being targeted by this form of racism. His comment that he "did want to retaliate," that he "did want to go back and fight" is evidence of both the social and personal nature of experiencing racist hate speech. Raul's story is consonant with others in regard to the social/personal duality of the experience.

In the moment, Raul felt a strong feeling of displeasure. His emotions appear torn between embarrassment and indignity. Together, the emotions are recalled as creating a course of frustration and inaction. Then anger urges him toward retaliation.

Fortunately, Raul's friend prevented him from fighting. According to the Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1993) "retaliation" is defined as "the return of evil for evil, the action of putting or inflicting in return for an aggression at places of our own choosing." By the point at which anger might lead to aggression, others intervened. By the same token, Junior considered his state of mind, during his experience of racist hate speech, as anger after being called "You stupid Natives" and after his wife was labeled "a big fat walrus." The insulting experience, which he interprets as a crime of aggression, arouses his moral indignation as he expresses his desire to confront the students from the University's fraternity house ("Of course, I was very angry"). He recalls a progression of emotion first at the inappropriateness of what was being done ("that they could say such things"), and then the very personal nature of the experience: "I felt angered and wanted to tell them… they don't know who I am…" Junior, too, is withheld from the expression of his genuine anger by others; his wife, friends, and his advisor.

Junior's indignation is evident as he recalls his reactions. He wants those who targeted him and his wife to be made accountable. The question "What do you have against people of a different race?" underlies much of the experience of hate speech. It implies for all co-researchers that their difference is not valued and therefore they are personally not valued, regardless of the perpetrators' ignorance of them socially and personally. For all co-researchers, the connection between injustice and their desire for some corresponding action is significant. In being treated in regard to a perception of the perpetrator, stereotyped, their response is delayed in the confusion

of whether to respond to the social aspect of the attack or its very personal nature. Jane also reacted to those of forms of hate speech, but expresses no desire for aggressive response. The co-researchers' indignation is seen as a response to attacks experienced at different levels. The feeling that one is being attacked can lead to a loss of control. Vengeance might be actual or, more usually, feelings of revenge or temporary derangement. Each co-researcher simply wanted to assert their right to be respected and treated equally. The expectation of social and personal justice was unmistakable in Jane's comment that "If I saw somebody doing that, I would stand up." Her speculation can be understood as a desire that someone (others present to the injustice) "do" something. All co-researchers express indignity at the idea that Americans simply stood by and allowed a lie to be made of a cultural value, central to our idea of what is "right." What is evident in the capta is that indignation is a response to social injustice and anger is a response to being socially generalized and personally targeted for injustice.

Only Lucy's indignation and anger were less evident from the interview. In the beginning, she said she did not react, but after a while displayed her displeasure and confronted the racist boys in New Mexico verbally: "You guys ain't cool." She recalls that she wanted to respond to them in some way, but felt she did not dare to tell anybody, certainly not officials or the police, as she feared she might be targeted for retaliation from the Hispanic boys. Lucy's response may be seen as similar to the others, but preceded by a gender response. For Lucy, the hate speech was first

perceived as a sexual threat. After she dealt with that perception, her experience follows a similar sequence to those of the other co-researchers.

Finally, of all the co-researchers, the person who was the most angry and incensed at being a target of racist hate speech was Bill. Bill had a strong feeling of indignation provoked by what he considered social action that was "out of line," shameful, and made even more egregious by the fact that he was targeted for injustice by those charged with upholding justice; the police. Aflame with anger, he was moved to a desire for revenge that remains as fresh as the experience for him: "I still get worked up every time I see those guys… It was obvious they were harassing me, trying to get me to react… I still want some kind of revenge."

His desire for justice is overshadowed by the personal nature of his experience. His thirst for justice is manifest. Yet, even though he could have reacted violently to the racism perpetrated by the policemen, he did not. In spite of his emotional turmoil and his strong inner frustration, and instead of putting himself into further trouble by reacting violently, he sought justice through the courts and sued the policemen for racism, harassment, and abuse of power. His action through the court is his effort to deal with the incidents as social injustice while his continued emotional state is evidence of his personal anger: "I think that they should suffer the kind of reprimand, you know, they deserve some kind of reprimand. The campus police… stereotyped me, by the way I look."

In summary, the co-researchers' felt indignant in response to the various forms of attacks of hate speech. Comments from the capta confirm the interviewees'

desire for justice to be served and that such racist interaction be stopped and perpetrators reprimanded. The victims' experiences also express feelings of anger. Some of them even display a desire for revenge. Finally, for all co-researchers, the connection between the injustice they experienced and their desire for some corresponding, rectifying action is significant.

Recognition of being stereotyped

In order to better understand the meaning of racial stereotyping, it is important to distinguish between racial discrimination, racial prejudice, and racial stereotyping itself. A racial stereotype is a generalization used to define an ethnic group based on same superficial characteristic(s) perceived by the perpetrator to be significant. When we oversimplify an individual or group by generalizing, we stereotype and fail to consider the differences in all of us. A racial prejudice is an attitude, almost always negative, about an entire ethnic group. Racial prejudice is exactly that – a pre-judgment based on stereotypes that we create with incomplete or inaccurate experience. Racial discrimination is what we do because of our racial stereotypes and our racial prejudices. It is the action one takes against someone different; as from another ethnic group. Such action humiliates, belittles, or disadvantages persons and groups.

Interviewees or co-researchers in this study belong primarily to ethnic minorities. Lucy is the only Caucasian, a member of the majority group or the "mainstream" race in the United States but was a minority in the circumstances described. Jane, Raul, Junior and Bill all belong to a "divergent" minority because

they are members of ethnic groups with physical characteristics which set them apart from the currently dominant group in the American society. As members of ethnic groups, co-researchers are aware of themselves as "minorities;" as having a less powerful status relative to the Caucasian majority. As such, they have often been subjected to unequal and differential treatment. The experience of hate speech is a part of a larger pattern of interaction.

It is evident throughout the capta that the co-researchers were racially stereotyped. Most even voiced the word "stereotype" to emphasize the fact that their experience stemmed from assumptions based on elements racist perpetrators thought were true about them in regard to their ethnic identity, not information known from any actual experience. Junior's narrative illustrates racial stereotyping towards Alaska Natives. People made demeaning comments to him and his wife, based on a fixed set of ideas that were exaggerated and distorted, concerning what they thought to be characteristics of all Alaska Natives, and allowing for no individual differences. "I believe that whatever they said must have been based on stereotypical data," Junior says, "'You're not educated, you're not civilized.' These… [ideas]… come from the stereotype."

Junior's perception corroborates the idea that stereotypes involve generalization. And what frustrates Junior is that he was not seen as himself. Instead, he and his wife were addressed through hurtful, racist perceptions. Perpetrators acted on who they assumed he was; what they assumed he should be.

Jane's experience of racial stereotyping is similar to Junior's in the sense that Alaska Natives, according to her, are too easily categorized as inferior. For instance, she knows that the stereotype expressed by Caucasians that "homeless, drunk Natives abound in the downtown area" is an opinion formed without reasonable justification, without actual experience. Jane's experience is that "natives only make up 40% of such citizens, the rest is composed of other races, most of them Caucasians." This exaggeration is assumption, acted upon as if it is real by those who look at other human beings and see only their own perceptions.

Bill locates his recognition of being stereotyped explicitly in his experience of being a person who had an abusive and unwelcome contact with the campus police because the policemen profiled him. They acted on the idea that his being an African American in a Cadillac fit some generalized expectation in which crime is caused by African Americans: "I owned a 1980 Cadillac, a big black car… it was stereotypical…as if I were a gangster, it fit the stereotype of movies." Not only did the police stereotype him, the stereotype itself was a cliché from the media; a stereotype second-hand from the movies.

The policemen's stereotypical representation of an African American in a big Cadillac was a profile based on the popular media of gangsters' movies. It was a label that superimposed a persona of Bill as "bad," that is, a person to be feared and hated by the mainstream. Bill's second experience of racism at the University illustrates the extent to which the policemen not only formed an unfavorable perspective before

even making contact with him, but did so repeatedly: "So here's your pager, here's your cell phone, where are your drugs?"

This kind of racism is obvious. Bill felt victimized by the profile even before blatant, demeaning hints and physical harassment. "Black" being seen by the harassing police as associated with the mediated stereotype. Because Bill was a Black man with a cell phone and a pager, he was therefore the "typical drug dealer." The policemen physically pushed him against the wall without reason. They had no idea of wrongdoing, no knowledge beforehand, only a mediated expectation. This incident in the campus basketball center is de facto racial stereotyping as the policemen already had a standardized conception: an expectation that represented a very oversimplified, uncritical judgment and affective attitude of the African American race, and young, male African Americans in general.

Raul felt that he was racially stereotyped because he was considered an "easy target." The hate speech perpetrator demeaned Raul's intellectual ability and implied that he did not deserve to be at college simply because he belonged to the Spanish community – "You don't deserve to be on this college here… Your family isn't smart enough." The racist student's assumption was certainly a skewed view formed on the basis of very little of his own knowledge and experience. However, even though statistics show that there are more uneducated Hispanic people than Caucasian people in Florida, he had no direct information about Raul. In addition, Raul attributes the angry student's racist behavior to that person's family experience; to his father's loss of employment to a Hispanic person.

Many times, the person who experiences stereotyping does not even think first of herself or himself in terms of racial membership in his or her ethnic group. Without ethnicity as a primary part of one's self-concept, it is doubly surprising and hurtful to be generalized and degraded based on that ethnicity. When Lucy danced alongside Hispanic people in New Mexico, she did not make a distinction about her skin color or her ethnic background. She simply joined the group because she wanted to dance. However, the Hispanic people who were there did not share her perspective. Their perception began first in race: "Oh, you dance pretty good for a White girl. You shake your butt pretty good for a White girl." In their interactional perspective, Caucasians were generalized; assumed to be inferior dancers because of their Caucasian background.

Race seems then to be the center of interracial interaction. But it can be said from these experiences that stereotyping, rather than person-to-person experience, forms much of the basis for interaction. Regardless of one's ethnicity, in interracial interaction, a first step is often taken in regard to stereotyped assumptions and expectations. And, clearly, regardless of race, such unfounded generalizations lead to harmful and painful things being said.

Ethnic resentment

"Love, friendship, respect, do not unite people as much as a common hatred of something." – Anton Chekhov.

Anti-African American, anti-Caucasian, anti-Alaska Native, or anti-Hispanic, ethnic resentment, a feeling of indignant displeasure towards a particular ethnic

group, is highly present in the experience of all of the research narratives and remains one of the burning issues of our time. It is one of the human faces of hate and, as an everyday experience, regardless of one's race or ethnicity, it is a more serious social problem than is generally acknowledged. Ethnic resentment is the cause for more harmful experience than any other single human social factor, except possibly for the persecution based on organized religion. Since the beginning of historical record, the tensions between ethnic groups have been characterized by the hatred of one group by another. And it seems evident that we have hated one another with little direct experience of one another.

Ethnic resentment is unique. Victims of ethnic resentment are targeted because of a core characteristic of their ethnic group, their physical identity. And physical attributes cannot be changed. Victims targeted on this basis often feel degraded, frightened, vulnerable, and suspicious. Ethnic members who share with victims the characteristics that made them targets of hate may also feel vulnerable, fearful, and powerless.

Ethnic resentment may be evidence of fear. It may be fear of someone who is different simply because he or she belongs to another race. While such fear may be irrational, it causes people to lash out at the "other." Fear is easily transmitted, especially from adults to children, and can easily be stirred up by reciting ugly stories and myths. Unfortunately, children learn resentment at an early age. They learn from media images of good guys and bad guys, and from their own experience of who lives in their neighborhood. Raul's narrative unequivocally demonstrates that he interprets

ethnic resentment as a perception that is passed down within groups from generation to generation. He understood that the person who accosted him may have been lashing out based on a perception of that person's father: "Someone told me that his [this kid's] dad lost his job to a Spanish family… I think that was why he had resented Spanish people so much."

From these experiences, it is evident that when a conflict or incident – even trivial – occurs, deeply held, racially-charged beliefs come into play in interaction. And when conflicts with racial dimensions do arise, students often do not have the skills to resolve them peacefully. Raul, however did not retaliate and stepped away from the incident as his friend suggested. Although target for racism, he chose not to fight with the racist student. I interpret Raul's attitude as "rising above;" peaceful rather than violent. It was an upholding of his understanding of American values. In the face of resentment, he returned no violence in spite of his indignation and anger.

Even though racism is not owned by any one group, ethnic resentment can be dangerous to those who are hated as well as to those who hate. By the same token, Bill's experience with the campus police illustrates that racism can even be enacted by those charged with enforcing the law; those whose place is to "serve and protect all citizens." Their use of an ethnic profile was motivated by his being African American. While not clearly an incident of hate speech in the usual sense, one can see that it results in the same experience for the person targeted. Junior's racist experience ("You stupid Natives") stems from action taken based on the perpetrator's unfounded, unreasonable resentment also. Ethnic name-calling and, above all, racist

hate speech based on ignorance simply encourage ethnic resentment by creating the unwanted and unwarranted experience of those targeted. The frustration, fear, and anger of those targeted spreads the anger and widens the communication gap. Jane's story best illustrates this. Her tormentors' words divide her from the commonality of being a student and demean her for no other reason than being visibly ethnic. When her attackers communicate their narrow hatefulness,

> …damned, drunk Natives… You all should not be allowed on campus…Natives are all fat, they all get pregnant when they're young, they're all drunk. All Natives should be wiped out. America is filled with worthless people like Natives… Natives are worthless, they are a down on our economy, all they do is drink, make babies;

her reactions are frustration, fear, and anger. She feels forced to withdraw from the public nature of education. She withdraws to the safety of her own group and wishes that her tormentors could see why what they do is immoral. Theirs is ethnic resentment stemming from racism based on ignorance. The racist students do not base their hate speech on actuality. It is recognized by Jane that not only is the racism enacted because of her racial difference, but is also a means for her tormentors to create their own solidarity of belonging among themselves. Looking down on others is, sadly, their way of elevating their own racial group. Jane's story also demonstrates that ethnic resentment has at least two victims: the individual targeted in the specific incident, and the race or ethnicity, to which that individual belongs.

The experiences of the interviewees shows that ethnic resentment can arise from a variety of racist causes. Those who insulted the interviewees in this research exemplify that intolerance leads to misunderstanding, stereotyping, and conflict. These stories tell us how ethnic resentment can be contagious. "Minority" itself means outnumbered and when no one from the majority steps forward to object, both the perpetrator and the victim interpret the silence as condoning the offense.

Lucy's experience shows that ethnic resentment can target anyone and is intended to hurt and intimidate individuals because they are perceived to be different with respect to their race and powerless in the social situation. Hate speech in the many forms seen here create friction and breach in the social fabric at a very personal level. The co-researchers interpret the experience of ethnic resentment as racism, hatred, and ignorance. It creates embarrassment, frustration, anger, and in the end, the same ethnic resentment that set it into motion. Those targeted for resentment then learn to resent those who target them.

Ethnic superiority

To experience the co-constructed research narratives is to experience life permeated with communicative evidence of a distinction between "us and them." The co-researchers are made separate by hate speech which focuses on their ethnicity or race. "US" and "THEM" signifies the perpetrator's perception of ethnic superiority.

Ethnic superiority is, at a basic level, defensive. For whatever historical reason, people notice differences and similarities between themselves and others. Races are biological and genetically distinct from one another in a visible way. This

visible distinction comes to stand for, to be a sign of, other cultural differences that are not so easily observable. In a social situation where one race has some economic, class, or social advantage over others, perceptions of superiority and inferiority emerge.

The co-researchers sensed that the racist perpetrators in their experience, through their words and attitudes, conveyed their perceptions of their superiority. The fact that they regarded their own race as the more significant and judged their victims' race as inferior simply because they look different and do things differently is evidence of blatant ethnocentrism. From the victims' interpretation, this ethnocentric perception was a very widespread attitude. Persons expressed their perceptions of superiority in the various forms of hate speech experienced by the co-researchers. Those believing themselves "superior" demonstrated their perception of superiority in various ways by denigrating their victims to the point that, at least symbolically, they refused to acknowledge any human equality. The co-constructed narratives make it evident that the racist behaviors they experienced were perpetrators' instinctive need to protect their own values, beliefs, and customs which they identify with their race. Usually, hate speech is enacted by those who feel threatened by those of other races. For instance, from Junior's narrative one senses the understanding that he interprets the fraternity boys as enacting their perception of their ethnic superiority. He explains that he thinks the racist Caucasians insulted him and his wife as a display of their feelings of superiority. The hate speech was

communicated "to make them feel more secure," both as a group and as a racial group.

By saying "just to make them feel more secure," Junior intends us to understand that the racist students thought that the superiority or inferiority of an ethnic group is related to differences in physical appearance. That they literally "see" superiority and inferiority as signified by racial characteristics and that their security lies in their superiority. This mindset led to their communication of difference in the form of racial insult and slur.

Junior believes that whispering comments, physical avoidance, and forms of eye contact are all communicative of perceptions of racial superiority. When he was in the University cafeteria where some Caucasians looked at him as if he were an alien, Junior felt he was considered to be a student who was "not good enough" to be there. Such communication of the superiority sometimes leads those who feel superior to demonize members of an ethnic "them." Jane's narrative illustrates how racist students communicate perceptions of ethnic superiority to Alaska Natives.

> Natives should not be allowed on campus… All Natives should be wiped out. America is filled with worthless people like Natives… Natives are worthless, they are a down on our economy, all they do is drink, make babies.

Such expressions of superiority are difficult to accomplish without the misconceptions of stereotyping. Not only do the racist students act on the misconception that ALL Alaska Natives share these characteristics, but they also

manage to infer that their race is superior to that of the Native American race because the inferred characteristics are only the characteristics of natives.

In the same perspective, Lucy felt singled out and rejected by Hispanic people when she was a student in New Mexico. She attributes her experience of racism to her being Caucasian – therefore, visibly White. From her comments on what the Hispanic people thought of her, she obviously "did not deserve" or "was not good enough" to live in a geographical area dominated by them. In contrast, an ethnic group sometimes feels inferior towards another ethnic group. From Lucy's words, her problems come from Hispanic people who assume that they do not have as good grades as the Caucasians do. Her experience was that Hispanic people, at least those in the surroundings of the University of New Mexico, have feelings of inferiority regarding their academic performance.

The most blatant instance of an expression of ethnic superiority is easily understood in Bill's story. Because the police have legitimate social power, they acted in regard to racial and social superiority. They believed Bill was inferior racially and urged a profile as cause to act toward him as socially inferior. Bill is African American. He is dark brown skinned, brown-eyed, with tightly curled black hair, as well as a broad flat nose, and thick lips. The policemen are Caucasian. By blindly categorizing Bill, based on his belonging to an ethnic group that is different from theirs, and prejudging him as a drug dealer without any evidence, the policemen acted on perceptions of superiority and inferiority, and their legitimate power unreasonably

associated with communicative actions that, under any other conditions, would be seen as racism.

The theme of ethnic superiority is also expressed through the communication of ethnic jokes. Ethnic jokes told within the hearing of those who are the "butts" of such jokes can be racially divisive and demeaning. Such humor is sometimes insulting and sometimes obscene, but always with some aggressive intent. Jane recounts hearing such jokes directed towards Alaska Natives. For instance, she recalls this from her experience on campus: "How do you call a Native?… That's easy… yell… "Beer!" Raul also recounts hearing jokes of which the butts are Mexicans. To him, it seemed that every joke that deals with dirt and/or the absence of intelligence, according to Raul, always has Mexicans in them.

From the research narratives, I developed an understanding of the experience of racial superiority and racial inferiority. Clearly, the physical expression of the victim's genes – such as hair color and skin color – the history and origin of their race, beliefs, and way of life led the racist students and policemen to demonstrate their feelings of ethnic superiority and to express those feelings in language and other communicative acts. The co-researchers undoubtedly interpret this sorting of people according to their race as a weapon used by racists to increase their feeling of hegemony and, in the case of the policemen, to extend their social power.

Conclusion and findings

In this final analysis of the capta, the co-constructed research narratives of the interviewees' interpreted lived experiences allowed four themes to emerge. From

their experiences, it is found that racist hate speech is not only talk, but can be seen as other communicative actions. Based on perceptions of racial superiority, ethnic resentment creates in the co-researchers an experience of frustration, disappointment, indignation, anger, and the feeling of being stereotyped and targeted as people of "inferior ethnicity." Yet the co-researchers themselves are just as likely to stereotype as those who communicate these things to them. Lucy expressed feeling targeted when her ethnicity is in the minority, but on her new campus, where she is of the majority, she says she "never experienced racism" and would take the same communication directed toward her as "a joke." Raul's experience of stereotyping is little different from that he discusses where some Hispanic people denigrate others based on their nationality and use of their shared language. Neither the concept of "minority" nor of "majority" seem to clearly distinguish how the communication of hate speech represents a clear concept of difference.

The experience of hate speech appears no different to one group than to another. The experience itself seems to transcend belonging to one group or another and go to a human level. Those targeted for forms of hate speech experience indignation first. Each co-researcher expects and hopes for someone to step forward, denounce the racism, and in doing so uphold American values and justice. Their indignation expresses their reaction to injustice and to the disappointment of that injustice going unchallenged. Indignation is a response to a social level of experience.

A second aspect of the experience of hate speech is anger. The co-researchers are frustrated to be targeted; to be singled out for something over which no one has

control. To be targeted for denigration based on one's genetic group, to be stereotyped, is experienced here as hateful in the most personal sense. Junior knows and says that there "is no difference" between people at a level prior to race or color. Together, the injustice and frustration lead the co-researchers here to a desire for some redress; some appropriate reprimand, rebuke, or retaliation. When none occurs, each is left with the very personal experience of hate speech. It is a feeling of isolation and anger.

After the feelings of anger emerge into this shared experience, a transformation can be seen to follow. After being targeted for resentment based on attributes of the personal self, the co-researchers' narratives demonstrate that such resentment then breeds resentment in the experience of those targeted. Co-researchers come to mirror the perspectives of those who have communicated through hate speech.

Unlike most research on hate speech, this study has addressed not what it is, but how it is. By understanding the lived experience of hate speech, more questions are implied for further understanding. Future research must study how it is possible that on university campuses hate speech remains common when the most usually touted antidote to racism is education. It may prove interesting to study why an "official" perspective espoused regarding hate speech is that on a university campus "people don't do that," that students at the college level are somehow beyond such communication. And finally, it may be informative to do further experiential research to understand the inaction of onlookers to hate speech. A question might be whether

such inaction represents a fear of involvement or that there is some other meaning implied.

References

Cox, T. (1993) Cultural diversity in organizations. San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler Pulishers.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). Interpretive interactionism. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Giles, H., & Leets, L. (1997). Words as weapons - When do they wound? Human Communication Research, 24, 3, 260-302.

Gove, P. B. et al (1993). Webster's third new international dictionary. Springfield, MA: Merrim-Webster Inc., Publishers.

Greenawalt, K. (2000). Fighting words. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Greene, L. S. (1995). Racial discourse, hate speech, and political correctness, National Forum, 75, 2, 32-36.

Harley, A. et al (2001). Cambridge international dictionary of English, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hemmer, J. J. (1996). Hate speech codes: The constitutionality issues. Communications and the Laws,18, 2, 23-42.

Heumann, M., & Church, T. W. (1997). Hate speech on campus. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kvale, S. (1996). InterViews. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lanigan, R. L. (1988). Phenomenology of communication: Merleau-Ponty's thematics in communication and semiology. Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Leo, J. (2000). Watch what you say. U.S. News and World Report, 128, 11, 18.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). Narrative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Locke, L. F., Wyrick Spirduso, W., & Silverman, S. (1993). Proposals that work. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). Narrative knowing and the human sciences. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Schutz, A., & Baumeister, R. F. (1999). The language of defense: Linguistic patterns in narratives of transgression. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18, 3, 269-286.

Skinner, J. (1996). Students' free speech. U.S. News and World Report, 42, 5, 25-37.

Somner, K. (1998). Wounds today. U.S. News and World Report, 15, 4, 12-23.

Strossen, N. (1997). Why the American Civil Liberties Union opposes hate speech codes. Academic questions, 10, 3, 33-41.

Sublum, Jacob (1994). Bad words. Reason, 26, 4, 64-68.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Elite discourse and racism. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Walker, S. (1997). Hate speech. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Whillock, R. K., & Slayden, D. (1995). Hate speech. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

Ethical guidelines of privacy, no coercion, confidentiality, protection from harm, sharing results, debriefing, sharing benefits, and ensuring high ethical standards will be strictly followed in this study. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. Your name will not appear in any report or paper. Rather, a pseudonym will be used for the narrative story from your interview. Strict guidelines for participant confidentiality and impartiality, as well as a respect for all persons regardless of gender, age, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, are being observed.

The research project will explore the narratives of the experiences of individuals who have experienced racist hate speech. You are being asked to spend about one to two hours of your time in conversation. The interview will be audio recorded for transcription and qualitative analysis. The audio tape will be destroyed directly following the transcription process. Any names that should be mentioned in the research capta will be deleted in the transcription process. The interviewee's identity will remain confidential and pseudonyms will be used in the transcriptions. There is no risk involved in the research process to participants or researcher nor any anticipated circumstances where you will be terminated from the project by the researcher, but if any should arise in the research process, you will be immediately notified. If for any reason you wish to withdraw from the study while it is in progress, simply notify me by email or by mail at the addresses listed below. There is no penalty for early withdrawal. Most people find that discussing their experience leaves them feeling better. However, should you experience discomfort after discussing your experience, please contact the UAF Center for Health and Counseling at 474 - 7043. Furthermore, if you have any questions about this research, it has been approved by the UAF Institutional Review Board (IRB), and for more information you may contact Vice Dean Charles Geist at 474 – 7231.

By reading and signing this informed consent form, you agree to participate in this study and understand the ethical guidelines listed above (I will stick a stamp on a blank envelope so that you can mail this form to me directly).

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

(your address is optional: this consent form can be photocopied when delivered in person and returned to you then or it can be mailed to you if you mail it in)

CONTACT TELEPHONE #:_____

(needed to set appointments for consultation and interview)

Thank you for your interest and participation in this research project. A copy of the research results will be mailed to you at your request.

If you have any questions please contact me at my office or my home:

Researcher:	Jonathan Matusitz
Office telephone:	474-1876
Home telephone:	455-3715
Email:	ftjam2@uaf.edu
Office:	Rm. 401, Department of Communication, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Sincerely,

Jonathan A. Matusitz, Graduate student,

University of Alaska Fairbanks, Department of Communication

Appendix B

Interview Guide Sample

While employing a qualitative research interviewing approach, the interview served as a guided conversation. I asked very broad questions to every co-researcher, whereas most of my voiced questions were more precise and were used to elicit further detail or clarification:

1) Tell me about your experience of racist hate speech on a university campus? When and where did it happen? Who were these people?
2) How did you react? Did you tell officials, friends, or relatives?
3) Were there onlookers witnessing the racist situation? If so, how did they react to the racist hate speech voiced by the perpetrator(s) towards you?
4) Have you encountered other situations of racist hate speech since then?
5) Do you have anything else to add?